



PATENT  
Customer Number 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 06753.0386

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Hajime ITO et al.

Serial No.: 09/699,371

Filed: October 31, 2000

For: VEHICLE INFORMATION  
PROCESSING METHOD,  
APPARATUS THEREFOR AND  
VEHICLE THEREWITH

)  
)  
) Group Art Unit: 3661  
)  
) Examiner: O. Hernandez  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

RECEIVED

JUL 26 2002

GROUP 3600

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Attached are substitute pages 4, 7, and 9 for the Amendment filed June 13, 2002, to correct inadvertent markings. Substitute pages 4, 7, and 9 are a clean version, substantively identical, and do not add any new matter or content to the previously filed Amendment of June 13, 2002.

No fee is believed to be due; however, please charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Dated: July 25, 2002

By: David W. Hill  
David W. Hill  
Reg. 28,220

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW, GARRETT,  
& DUNNER, L.L.P.  
1300 I STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
202-408-4000

*Copy of Paper #8*

11. (Amended) A vehicle information processing apparatus for processing diversified pieces of information in a vehicle, including a message comprising at least one of a message arriving at the vehicle and a message generated in the vehicle, comprising:

a priority order control means for integrating said diversified pieces of information and providing each of the integrated pieces of information with a priority order indicating an importance of each piece of information; and

a resource allocation control means for, when one or more pieces of information are processed in said vehicle, allocating one or more appropriate resources selected from a plurality of diversified resources to the integrated pieces of information according to the priority order given to the integrated pieces of information.

14. (Amended) A vehicle information processing apparatus according to claim 11 wherein the diversified resources include one or more information communicating means prepared for each organ of sense so as to communicate the information to a driver by appealing to a combination of one or more organs of sense.

15. (Amended) A vehicle information processing apparatus according to claim 14 wherein the diversified resources include one or more information communicating styles corresponding to a characteristic of each information communicating means.

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

It is noted that Applicants' representatives conducted an interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor on May 13, 2002, to discuss the restriction and election of species requirements, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,688 to Dominke et al (hereinafter "Dominke"), and the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of claims 1, 11, and 21. Applicants sincerely appreciate the opportunity for the interview.

With respect to the restriction and election of species requirements, the Examiners gave further explanation regarding this requirement, originally set forth in the Office Action mailed October 10, 2001, and made final in the last Office Action. Applicants requested clarification and reconsideration during the interview, whereupon the Examiner's supervisor suggested to Applicants representatives to set forth in this response reasons and arguments in favor of withdrawing the requirement. Applicants have provided such explanation and argument below and respectfully request that the requirement be withdrawn.

Finally, Claims 1 and 11 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite. The Examiner also rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite, and further, asserted that the claim is an omnibus type claim. During the interview, Applicants' representatives and the Examiners discussed this rejection. The amendments made herein are respectfully deemed to more clearly define the invention.

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW, GARRETT,  
& DUNNER, L.L.P.  
1300 I STREET, N. W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
202-408-4000

"lacking" other inventions is not a thorough analysis for obviousness. Applicants submit that the groupings of inventions characterized by the Examiner are not appropriate to sustain an election of species requirement.

In addition, there would be no burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims in this application on its merits. M.P.E.P § 803 reads that "if the search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits." (Emphasis added). Applicants respectfully request that this requirement should be applied in the present application to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to the Applicants and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the election of species requirement.

**35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. Further, the Examiner objected to these claims for informalities. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to attend to the informalities. The Examiner also rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite, and further, asserted that the claim is an omnibus type claim. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization that claim 21 is an omnibus type claim. Nevertheless, in order to advance prosecution, Applicants amend claim 21 to more appropriately claim the invention. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Therefore, in light of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of these and all rejections and allow pending claims 1-21.

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,  
FARABOW, GARRETT,  
& DUNNER, L.L.P.  
1300 I STREET, N. W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
202-408-4000